REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on February 8, 2008 and is being filed pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) as provided under 37 CFR §1.114. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action, claims 1-23 were pending. By way of the present response, Applicants have: (1) amended claims 2-6, 8, 10, 16, 18, and 20-23; (2) added no new claims; and (3) canceled claims 9 and 17. As such, claims 1-8, 10-16, and 18-23 are now pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now presented.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C § 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102 as being anticipated by Peled, et al., Publication No. 20020129140 (hereinafter "Peled").

The Office Action alleges that Peled discloses all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Peled does not disclose reassembling intercepted packets into an intercepted document.

In contrast, claim 1 recites:

maintaining a plurality of stored signatures in a data storage device, each signature being associated with one of a plurality of registered documents;
    intercepting packets being transmitted over a network;
    reassembling the packets into an intercepted document;
    calculating a set of signatures **associated with the intercepted document**; and

comparing the set of signatures **associated with the intercepted document** with the plurality of stored signatures to determine if the **intercepted document** contains content associated with a registered document.

(Claim 1, emphasis added).

Peled describes extracting signatures from individual packets. The Office Action relies upon Peled's description of a buffered batch of packets to disclose reassembling the packets into an intercepted document. (Office Action dated 2/8/08, page 2 referencing Peled, paragraph [0055]). Applicants respectfully disagree: Peled describes working with chunks of files, but does not disclose reassembling an entire file. For example, if a "hit" is located for a single packet,

> a full hash may be calculated on a **larger block** using the location of the hit as an offset for the middle **of a chunk being tested**. ... **The chunk being tested should be large enough** to contain significant entropy **even if the file from which it is taken does not** have a particularly high entropy density level.

(Peled, paragraph [0173], emphasis added).

As Peled only works with "chunks" of buffered packets, it does not disclose what is required by claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome.

Given that claims 2-5 and 7 are dependent upon claim 1, and include additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 3-5 and 7 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as above.

Regarding claim 8, similar to above, Peled fails to disclose reassembling intercepted packets into an intercepted document. Furthermore, Peled does not disclose associating a registered document with a user that requested registration of the document. In contrast, claim 8 recites:

> a network interface module to connect the apparatus to a network;
> a signature database to store a first set of signatures, the first set of signatures being associated with a registered object, **wherein the first set of signatures stored in the signature database is associated with a user who requested registration of the registered object**;
> an object capture module to intercept packets being transmitted over the network;
> **an object assembly module to reassemble the packets into an intercepted object**; and
> a registration module comprising a registration engine to generate a second set of signatures, the second set of signatures being associated with **the intercepted object**, and a search engine to compare the second set of signatures with the first set of signatures.

(Claim 8, emphasis added).

Applicants submit that Peled fails to disclose that each registered document is associated with a user that requested registration of the document. The Office Action alleges that Peled discloses this claim feature in the following: "The present invention seeks to provide a novel method and system for the mitigation of illegal an unauthorized transport of digital content, **without otherwise interfering with rightful usage and the privacy of the users**." (Peled, paragraph [0011], emphasis added). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action and submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret this sentence to disclose associating a registered document with a user. This

intention set out by Peled is in reference to providing a system for monitoring the transport of digital content *without over-monitoring and interfering with legitimate, and possibly private, data traffic.* (see, e.g., Peled, paragraph [0009]). Applicants submit that the Office Action's assertion is not within the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language and, therefore, Peled fails to disclose that each registered document is associated with a user that requested registration of the document.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 8 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as above.

Given that claims 10-12 and 14-15 are dependent upon claim 8, and include additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 10-12 and 14-15 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as above.

Regarding claim 16, similar to above, Peled fails to disclose

> maintaining a plurality of stored signatures in a data storage device, each signature being associated with one of a plurality of registered objects, **wherein each registered object is associated with a user that requested registration of the object**;
> intercepting packets being transmitted over a network;
> **reassembling the packets into an intercepted object**;
> calculating a set of signatures associated with the **intercepted object**; and
> comparing the set of signatures associated with the **intercepted object** with the plurality of stored signatures to determine if the intercepted document contains content associated with a registered document.

(Claim 16, emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 16 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as above.

Given that claims 18-21 are dependent upon claim 16, and include additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 18-21 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as above.

Regarding claim 22, similar to above, Peled fails to disclose

> receiving a document to be registered;
> calculating a set of one or more signatures for the document; and
> storing the set of signatures in a database for comparison against **signatures of captured documents, wherein the set of signatures is associated with a user that requested registration of the document.**

(Claim 22, emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 22 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as above.

Regarding claim 23, similar to above, Peled fails to disclose

> an object capture module to receive packets for an object to be registered;
> **an object assembly module to reassemble the packets into the object;**
> a registration module to calculate a set of one or more signatures **for the object**; and
> a signature database to store the set of signatures, **wherein the set of signatures is associated with a user that requested registration of the document.**

(Claim 23, emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 23 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as above.

35 U.S.C § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 6, 13, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peled in view of Koike, U.S. Publication No. 20030084300 (hereinafter "Koike").

Given that claims 6, 13, and 21 are dependent upon claims 1, 8, and 16 respectively, and include additional limitations, and given that Koike (and thus the combination) does not teach or suggest the shortcomings of Peled set out above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 6, 13, and 21 has been overcome for at least the same reasons as above.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: _August 5, 2008_   _____/Ryan W. Elliott/_____

Ryan W. Elliott
Reg. No. 60,156

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300

Appl. No.: 10/815,239   13   6897P007
Amdt. dated **8-5-08**
Reply to Final Office Action of 02/08/2008